REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the finality of the previous Office Action, for the Interview held on August 23, 2005, and for agreeing to consider the remarks submitted herewith.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-15, and 17-20 are pending. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in view of the above amendments and the remarks that follow are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The current Office Action basically repeats verbatim the previous Office Action mailed on July 27, 2005 without addressing the remarks in the September 27, 2005 Office Action Response.

Specifically, on page 2, the Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over U.S. Patent 5,257,387 to Richek et al (hereafter Richek) in view of U.S. Patent 5,634,072 to Allen et al (hereafter Allen). The Office Action acknowledges, on page 2, that Rickek does not disclose "calculating an optimal distribution of excess entitlement values to be reallocated to each active group by traversing once the list of active groups in the increasing order...." However, the Office Action asserts that:

> Allen discloses the real time maximum number of connection of a names structure type (e.g., lock, list, cache) is calculated at the first connect as the minimum of the formatted number from policy (col. 22, lines 40-44). The installation is given the flexibility to determine a maximum value based on the customer environment since limiting the number of connections to coupling facility structure will lessen the amount of the space used by the function data set. This value will be used to reserve total function data set for all coupling facility structures in the active policy and will be rounded to the next highest unit of 8 (col. 22, lines 51-58).

This assertion was restated again on page 5 in the "Response to Arguments" section. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Richek is directed to a computer implemented method and apparatus for dynamic and automatic configuration of a computer system and circuit boards including computer resource allocation conflict resolution. Allen is directed to a method and system for managing one or more coupling facilities in a data processing system. While acknowledging that Rickek does not disclose "calculating an optimal distribution of excess entitlement values to be reallocated to

each active group by traversing once the list of active groups in the increasing order...," the Office Action fails to address where and how Allen discloses or suggest this feature. The statements made in the Office Action in addressing this specific feature (as quoted above) have no connection with "calculating an optimal distribution ... by traversing once the list of active groups ..." In fact, nowhere does Allen disclose or suggest the feature of calculating an optimal distribution by traversing once the list of active groups.

Therefore, Richek and Allen, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "calculating an optimal distribution of the excess entitlement values to be reallocated to each active group by traversing *only* once the list of active groups in the increasing order; and reallocating the excess entitlement values to the active groups according to the optimal distribution for each active group, wherein optimal values reallocated to the active groups are in proportion to the respective entitlement values, and wherein a total resource reallocated to each of the active groups does not exceed a maximum limit for each of the active groups," as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added). Claim 1 is amended to more precisely recite the novel features of the present application.

Specifically, the present application computes an optimal distribution faster than any of the prior art methods (including Rickek and Allen) by traversing *only* once the list of groups without having to go through the list over and over. In other words, for an N-item list, the method of claim 1 only requires N steps to complete the calculation, not 2^N steps or N^2 steps (which is required by the prior art methods). The prior art methods (including Richek and Allen) allow for multitude of ways to computer a value, all of which takes a long time to run. Since Richek and Allen, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and MPEP § 2143.03. Claims 2 and 4-7 depend from claim 1, and for this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 2 and 4-7 are also allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

Regarding independent claim 8, for at least the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1, Rickek and Allen, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "calculates an optimal distribution of the excess entitlement values to be reallocated to each

active group by traversing only once the list of active groups in the increasing order; and reallocates the excess entitlement values to the active groups according to the optimal distribution for each active group, wherein optimal values reallocated to the active groups are in proportion to the respective entitlement values, and wherein a total resource reallocated to each of the active groups does not exceed a maximum limit for each of the active groups," as recited in amended claim 8 (emphasis added). Therefore, amended claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 10-14 depend from claim 8, and for this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 10-14 are also allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

Regarding independent claim 15, for at least the same reason as noted above with respect to claim 1, Rickek and Allen, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest "calculates an optimal distribution of the excess entitlement values to be reallocated to each active group by traversing only once the list of active groups in the increasing order; and reallocating the excess entitlement values to the active groups according to the optimal distribution for each active group, wherein optimal values reallocated to the active groups are in proportion to active groups' respective entitlement values, and wherein a total resource reallocated to each of the active groups does not exceed a maximum limit for the groups," as recited in amended claim 15 (emphasis added). Therefore, amended claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 17-20 depend from claim 15, and for this reason, and the additional features they recite, claims 17-20 are also allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-15, and 17-20 are allowable. Prompt allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **January 26, 2006**

Kelly T. Lee
Registration No. 47,743
Andrews Kurth LLP
1350 I Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739